

FISH & NEAVE

875 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022-6250

C O P Y

October 17, 1990

AIR MAIL

Mr. John H. Bass  
Reddie & Grose  
16 Theobalds Road  
London WC1X 8PL  
ENGLAND

RECEIVED  
PHILIP MORRIS MANAGEMENT CORP.  
LAW DEPT.-PATENT SECTION

OCT 22 1990

NOTED

Re: Pakistani Pat. Appln. No. 292/89  
Your File: 30591  
Our File: PM-1322 (Pakistan)

Dear John:

Thank you for your October 3, 1990 letter enclosing a copy of the official action in this case.

With respect to Paragraph 1 of the action, I do not see in what way the marked phases can be considered unclear. For that reason, I agree with you and your Pakistani associate. I take it that your associate can make an appropriate argument along those lines in accordance with Pakistani practice.

With respect to Paragraph 2, I would agree with your associate's suggestion, subject to the inclusion of the word "substantially" as in the specification.

With respect to Paragraph 3, I assume this arose because the Pakistani application was filed with the abstract page at the front.

With respect to Ellis et al. U.S. Patent 3,356,094, a copy is enclosed. You are correct that it inadvertently escaped the deletion of identification of prior art. I recall that in some other countries, those identifications had to be put back in. However, here, and elsewhere where there has been no such requirement, I wonder

2023049171

Mr. John H. Bass

October 17, 1990

2

if, for consistency, it is possible to delete the identification of Ellis, so that page 2, lines 2-4 read "... article. In a similar smoking article, the tube becomes ...". I do not expect this to obviate the need to supply a copy of Ellis, but it might make the specification read better. Please let me have your thoughts.

Please let me know if you need anything further to prepare a response.

Very truly yours,

JEFFREY H. INGERMAN

Jeffrey H. Ingerman

JHI:bas  
Enc.

✓ cc: Ms. Beverly A. Monroe (w/o enc.)

2023049172